



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,469	12/14/2001	Vivek Nirke	MSI-928US	5249
22801	7590	10/30/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201				DINH, KHANH Q
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/017,469	NIRKHE ET AL.	
	Examiner Khanh Dinh	Art Unit 2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Amendment and Remarks filed on 8/22/2006. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 11, 13-17, 19-24, 26-39 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley et al., US pat. No.5,604,490 (hereafter Blakley) in view of Smith et al, US pat. No.6,578,078 (hereafter Smith).

As to claim 1, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising:

receiving on a computer in a first network (a subsystem of fig.1) a user name associated with a user in the first network, wherein the first network uses a first operating system and mapping the user name to a user name associated with the user in a second network (other subsystem of fig.1) and mapping the user name associated with the same user in the second network to a user identification number (user identification) associated with the user in the second network [see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28].

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

As to claims 2 and 3, Blakley discloses accessing resources on a computer in the second network using the user identification number and authenticating the user after the mappings (using authentication service UAS, see col.4 lines 15-58).

As to claims 4 and 6, Blakley discloses that first network uses a personal computer based operating system and a gateway (28 fig.1) (see fig.1, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57).

As to claim 11, Blakley discloses a computer-readable medium storing computer-executable instructions to map a user name associated with a user in a first network (a subsystem of fig.1) that uses a first operating system to a user name associated with a user in a second network (other subsystem of fig.1) and to map the user name associated with the user in the second network to a user identification number (user identification) associated with the user in the second network [see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28].

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

As to claim 13, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising: receiving on a computer in a first network (a subsystem of fig.1) using a first operating system a user name and a password associated with a user in a second network (other cluster 1 fig.6); authenticating the user using the user name and the password to produce an authenticated user and mapping the authenticated user to a user identification number associated with the user in a second network (another subsystem of fig.1) (using user authentication service to provide security information to user based on user ID and password when user login to other subsystems or networks, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28).

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one

of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 2.

As to claims 15-17, Blakley discloses the first network performing the authenticating, mapping, using a personal computer based operating system (see fig.1, col.1 lines 42-53 and col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57).

Claims 19-23 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 6-10 respectively.

As to claim 24, Blakley discloses a computer-readable medium storing computer instructions to receive on a computer network (a subsystem of fig.1) a user name and a password associated with a user in a second network (other subsystem in fig.1) using a operating system, to authenticate the user using the user name and the password to produce an authenticated user (using user authentication service to provide security information to user based on user ID and password, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53) and to map the authenticated user to a user identification number associated with the user in a second network (see fig.2, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28).

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

As to claim 26, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising: receiving on a computer in a second network (a subsystem of fig.1) a user identification number (User ID) associated with a user in a first network using a first network operating system (other subsystem of fig.1) and mapping the user identification number to a user name associated with the same user in the second network, wherein the user's user identification number maps to more than one user name for the user in the heterogeneous network (using user authentication service to provide security information to user based on user ID and password, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28).

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings

into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

As to claim 27, Blakley discloses accessing resources on a computer in the second network using the user name (see fig.1, col.1 lines 42-53 and col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57).

Claims 28-30 and 32-36 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 15-17 and 19-23 respectively.

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 24 and 25 respectively.

As to claims 39 and 43, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising: receiving on a computer in a first network (a subsystem of fig.1) a user name associated with a user in the first network; mapping the user name to a user name associated with the user in a second network (other subsystem of fig.1) and mapping the user name associated with the same user in the second network to a user identification number associated with the user in the second network, wherein the mapping includes using a map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override; wherein the user's user identification number maps to more than one user name for the user in the heterogeneous network (using user authentication service to provide

security information to user based on user ID and password when user login to other subsystems or networks, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 57 and col.5 lines 1-28).

Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

4. Claims 7-10, 40, 41, 42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley and Smith and further in view of White, US pat. No.6,826,692 (hereafter White).

As to claim 41, Blakley discloses a method for mapping a user in a heterogeneous network comprising: receiving on a computer in a first network a user name and a password associated with a user in a second network and authenticating the user using the user name and the password to produce an authenticated user; (using authentication service that handles clients' access to the clusters 1, see col.11 lines 5-64) and mapping the authenticated user to a user identification number associated with the user in a second network (other cluster of fig.6) (using

Art Unit: 2151

user authentication service to provide security information to user based on user ID and password, see abstract, figs.1, 2, 3A, col.1 lines 42-53 and col.4 line 33 to col.5 line 36). Blakley does not specifically disclose users at the two networks using different operating systems. However, Smith discloses that users at the two networks use different operating systems (users access different network operating systems such as Unix and MS-DOS, see fig.6, abstract, col.5 lines 7-45 and col.19 line 20 to col.20 line 18). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Smith's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to manage network communication in different network operating systems because it would have allowed users to retrieve and to display web documents from different operating systems in a communication network (see Smith's col.6 lines 11-32).

Neither Blakley nor Smith specifically discloses wherein the mapping includes using a map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override. However, White discloses the mapping includes using a map on a mapping server and the mapping server maintains a default map, a simple map and/or explicit maps that provide override (see figs.1, 2, col.7 line 63 to col.8 line 67 and col.9 lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement White's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to process data information in a communication network because it would have established a network connection, logged a user onto the network without returning login functions to the user workstation (see White's col.9 lines 19-65).

As to claims 40, 42 and 44, White discloses algorithms for unmapping users, mapping multiple users and/or group mapping (see figs.1, 2, col.7 line 63 to col.8 line 67 and col.9 lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement White's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to process data information in a communications network because it would have established a network connection, logged a user onto the network without returning login functions to the user workstation (see White's col.9 lines 19-65).

As to claims 7-10, White discloses a client, a map on a mapping server and mapping including using remote procedure calls and the remote procedure calls comprise at least one remote procedure call selected from the group consisting of getting credentials, authenticating using credentials, checking map status, and dumping maps remote procedure calls (see figs.1, 2, col.7 line 63 to col.8 line 67 and col.9 lines 1-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement White's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to process data information in a communications network because it would have established a network connection, logged a user onto the network without returning login functions to the user workstation (see White's col.9 lines 19-65).

5. Claims 5, 12, 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley and Smith in view of Gudjonsson, US pat. No.6,564,261. Blakley and Smith's teachings still applied as in item 3 above. Neither Blakley nor Smith specifically discloses using a graphical user interface and a UNIX based operating system.

However, Gudjonsson discloses using a graphical user interface and a UNIX based operating system (a standard GUI program with a persistent connection to the server, see col.34 lines 26-55 and col.38 lines 1-53). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Gudjonsson's teachings into the computer system of Blakley to process data information in a communications network because it would have provided program displays certain icons, buttons, dialogue boxes in its windows on the screen in a communications network and enabled communication services between users to connect to each others in a variety of network operating systems.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Claims 1-44 are rejected.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



KHANH DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100